



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/025,143	02/18/1998	MARK W. BURKE	9318-0004	9234

20583 7590 12/17/2002

PENNIE AND EDMONDS  
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 100362711

EXAMINER

LAO, SUE X

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

24

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten mark

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/025,143

Applicant(s)  
Burke

Examiner  
S. Lao

Art Unit  
2126



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 27, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 19, 21, and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 16, 19, 21, 22 are pending. This action is in response to the amendment filed 9/27/2002.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach "correlating the information of the content of the object invocation with one or more objects of the object collection to construct the invocation" as recited in claim 22.

In the application as filed, there does not appear to be any detailed descriptions or disclosure of correlating the information of the content of the object invocation with one or more objects of the object collection.

Applicant discloses, in the application as filed, interrogating repository objects and discovering encapsulator objects. See page 7, lines 14-17; page 8, lines 10-13; page 9, lines 3-13; page 11, lines 9-13. Applicant fails to disclose *correlating* the information of the content of the object invocation with one or more objects of the object collection in the specification as filed.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant recites "correlating the information of the content of the object invocation with one or more objects of the object collection to construct the invocation" in claim 22. There does not appear to be a written description of the claimed limitation in the application as filed, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16 recites "object interface information" on line 3 and "the object definition information" on line 6, which is inconsistent.

5. Claim <sup>22</sup>~~21~~ is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo et al ("Module Reuse by Interface Adaption") in view of Gamma et al (Design Patterns: Elements of Reusable Object-oriented Software, pp. 87-96, 139-150).

In the following rejection, the limitation of correlating is considered based on a broad and fair interpretation for the reasons stated in section 3 of this Office action.

As to claim <sup>32</sup>~~21~~, Purtilo teaches a method of constructing (coerce interface structure/patterns) an object invocation (procedure/function call), including steps of generating an object collection of objects (generate adaptors / library of coercion modules) corresponding to rules (Nimble map) specifying the syntax of the object invocation (syntactically/semantically equivalent interface parameters),

receiving information of the content of the object invocation (procedure/function call),

correlating the information of the content of the object invocation with one or more objects of the object collection to construct the invocation (rearrange parameters of an interface pattern at the point of procedure/function call). See page 544, line 1 - page 549, 1st para.

Purtilo does not teach that the software modules / adaptors are implemented by object-oriented objects, nor the step of generating implemented by instantiating. This,


however, would have been an obvious choice, and additionally taught by Gamma (adaptor pattern) who implements every software modules of an adapting system (client, target, adaptee, adaptor) in an object-oriented fashion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to implement adaptors and other software modules of Purtilo by object-oriented objects. In the combined teaching, the step of generating would have been implemented by instantiating. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combined the teachings of Purtilo and Gamma in order to take advantage of object-orientation.

6. Claims 19 and 21 are allowed.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/2002 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue Lao whose telephone number is (703) 305-9657. A voice mail service is also available at this number. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications and (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official/Draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Sue Lao 

December 6, 2002